

contiguous with the outer edge at least on the two opposite sides of the outer edge in claims 1, and 5, and on all four sides in claims 18, 23, 25, 26, and 31. This structure is not disclosed by the three flange lid of Waters either along or in combination with any of the other references cited. Claims 51-65 all require the lid to be molded from a plastic material as a single layer of material. This structure clearly is not disclosed or suggested by the double wall lid of Waters or in combination with any of the other references cited such as the triple wall or layer lid of Wischhusen, et al.

With the other structure of parent claims 1 and claim 58 the lid of these claims is not disclosed or suggested by Waters either alone or in combination with any of the references cited. In this respect, it is not seen that either Waters, Wischhusen, et al. or Thomas disclose or teach the area of the lower surface to be greater than the total area surrounded by the outer edges of the recesses as set forth in both claims 1 and 58. It is impossible to determine the area of the lower surface of Waters relative to the recesses. As pointed out previously, the area of the lower surface of the bottom of the lid of Wischhusen, et al. appears to be less than that of the recesses. Thus if the teaching of Wischhusen, et al. was applied to Waters, the same teaching would carry over to Waters.

Moreover, as pointed out previously, it is not proper to combine the teaching of patents in completely different fields of art to reject the claims. Waters is directed to an outdoor tool box and Wischhusen, et al. is directed to a food container which have no relationship to each other and their combination to reject the claims is improper.

Clearly neither Waters or Wischhusen, et al. disclose or suggest the single layer lid of claims 51-65 since these patents both disclose double wall or triple wall or layer lids or covers.

Claims 8, 10, 11, 14, and 17 all require the lid to be molded solely from a plastic material and to be a solid member. The cover of Thomas is noted, however, when it is formed, steel reinforcing members 42 are embedded in the cover and hence it is not molded solely from a plastic material.

Thus, the application of Thomas with Waters or Waters and Wischhusen, et al. teach away from the structure of claims 8, 10, 11, 14, and 17.

Also claims 5, 18, 25, 59, 60, and 61 and their dependent claims all require the lid to have the strength sufficient to withstand a load of at least 8,000 pounds. There is no indication that the lid of Waters and particularly the lid of Wischhusen, et al. can withstand this load.

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the above identified application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is requested.

Enclosed is an Invention Disclosure Statement and a check in the amount of \$609.00 for the additional claims and the Invention Disclosure Statement.

If any additional fees are required, please charge our deposit account No. 23-2770.

Respectfully submitted,



Arthur F. Zobal, Reg. No. 20,616

Date: April 8, 2003

Decker Jones, McMackin, McClane, Hall & Bates, P.C.

Burnett Plaza, Suite 2000

801 Cherry Street, Unit#46

Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6836

PH: 817.336.2400, Fax: 817.336.2181

Attorney For Applicant